



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/941,139	08/28/2001	Joel Kahn	1086	5902
75	590 06/12/2003			
Kirschstein, Ottinger, Israel & Schiffmiller, P.C. 489 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10017-6105			EXAMINER	
			KOYAMA, KUMIKO C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2876	
			DATE MAILED: 06/12/2003	1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			¥
•	Application No.	Applicant(s)	_
Advisory Action	09/941,139	KAHN ET AL.	
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Examiner	Art Unit	_
	Kumiko C. Koyama	2876	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 07 May 2003 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea	void abandonment of this applice i) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in	
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moleaned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in	
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note because of the second o	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying th	е
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection.	etion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendment	, L
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request fo application in condition for allowance because: See	r reconsideration has been cons	sidered but does NOT place the	
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. \square The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disap	proved by the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	-f/W	
10.⊠ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>	S	UPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800	

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Stevens in view of Maggard and Koenck still meet the claimed invention. Stevens teaches that the personal agent, serving as a first reader, scans a barcode that would yield a stock number and conveys the stock number over the wireless system to the professional unit, which serves as a second reader (col 10, lines 11-16). The professional unit communicates the barcode stock numbers through a communication means, such as wireless communication, to the host to avoid the necessity for the store to rescan each item (col 10, lines 29-31, 38-43, col 16, lines 60+). Maggard is provided to clarify and support the details of the this communication process.

Continuation of 10. Other: Claims 30-42 remain rejected as set forth in the Final Office Action (see paper No. 4). Paper No. 5 (Response to the Final Office Action) will be entered upon filing of an appeal brief.